UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
Socialista (Bibliator of 102), Fordi	
	>
SHAW FAMILY ARCHIVES, LTD., EDITH	:
MARCUS and META STEVENS,	:05 CV 3939 (CM)
MARCUS and META STEVENS,	.03 C V 3939 (CIVI)
	:
Plaintiffs,	:
,	:Honorable Colleen McMahon
V.	.Hollorable Collecti McMalloli
	:
CMG WORLDWIDE, INC., an Indiana Corporation	•
and MARILYN MONROE, LLC, a Delaware Limited	•
Liability Company,	•
• •	•
D C 1 (•
Defendants.	:
	:
	1

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF MICHELLE M. CRAVEN

Michelle M. Craven, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declares as follows:

- 1. I am an associate with the law firm of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff Marilyn Monroe, LLC. I respectfully submit this supplemental declaration on behalf of Marilyn Monroe, LLC in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment on Count II Against Shaw Family Archives, Ltd., and in opposition to Shaw Family Archives, Ltd.'s and Bradford Licensing, Inc.'s Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment.
- 2. A true and correct copy of the Declaration of Amnon Z. Siegel in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, executed October 27, 2006, and filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, case no. CV-05-02200 (the "Consolidated California Action"), is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 3. A true and correct copy of the Tentative Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, issued December 11, 2006, in the Consolidated California Action, is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

- 4. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs Marilyn Monroe, LLC's and CMG Worldwide Inc.'s Supplemental Brief in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, filed December 18, 2006, in the Consolidated California Action, is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.
- 5. A copy of the Memorandum on Support of Defendant Norman Mailer's Motion to Dismiss, dated October 3, 1978, and filed in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York, Index No. 01527/75 (the "Frosch Case"), is attached hereto as Exhibit 4.
- 6. A true and correct copy of the Decision of Greenfield, J., dated January 29, 1979, and entered in the Frosch Case, is attached hereto as Exhibit 5.
- 7. A true and correct copy of the Brief for Defendant-Respondent Norman Mailer, dated March 31, 1980, and filed in the New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division—First Department, Index No. 01527/75 (the "Frosch Appeal"), is attached hereto as Exhibit 6.
- 8. A true and correct copy of the Brief for Defendant-Respondent Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., dated April 2, 1980, and filed in the Frosch Appeal, is attached hereto as Exhibit 7.
- 9. A true and correct copy of the Brief for Defendants-Respondents Alskog, Inc. and Norman Schiller, undated, and filed in the Frosch Appeal, is attached hereto as Exhibit 8.
- 10. A true and correct copy of the Reply Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant Aaron Frosch, undated, and filed in the Frosch Appeal, is attached hereto as Exhibit 9.
- 11. A true and correct copy of the Supplemental Declaration of Amnon Z. Siegel in Support of Plaintiffs' Supplemental Brief in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, dated December 18, 2006, is attached hereto as Exhibit 10.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 22nd day of December, 2006, in New York, New York.

Michelle M. Craven

100137588_2.DOC